

# United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO.              | FIL        | ING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.     | CONFIRMATION NO |
|------------------------------|------------|----------|----------------------|-------------------------|-----------------|
| 10/076,499                   | 02/19/2002 |          | David Higgs          | 5478-8A.1               | 2448            |
| 7590 10/04/2004              |            |          | EXAMINER             |                         |                 |
| Ian Fincham                  |            |          |                      | SAYALA, CHHAYA D        |                 |
| McFadden, Fir                | ncham      |          |                      |                         | B. DED 111115   |
| Suite 606                    |            |          |                      | ART UNIT                | PAPER NUMBER    |
| 225 Metcalfe S               | Street     |          | 1761                 |                         |                 |
| Ottawa, ON K2P 1P9<br>CANADA |            |          |                      | DATE MAILED: 10/04/2004 |                 |

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

|   | ·   | Application No.   | Applicant(s)   |  |  |  |  |
|---|---|---|--|--|--|--|--|
|   | Office Action Commons   | 10/076,499  | HIGGS ET AL.   |  |  |  |  |
|   | Office Action Summary   | Examiner  | Art Unit   |  |  |  |  |
|   |   | C. SAYALA   | 1761   |  |  |  |  |
| Period fo                                     | The MAILING DATE of this communication app<br>or Reply  | ears on the cover sheet with the c  | orrespondence address  |  |  |  |  |
| THE - Exte after - If the - If NC - Failu Any | ORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION. nsions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.13 SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. so period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period we re to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing ed patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). | 36(a). In no event, however, may a reply be time within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from a cause the application to become ABANDONE | nely filed s will be considered timely. the mailing date of this communication. O (35 U.S.C. § 133). |  |  |  |  |
| Status  |   |   |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1)  | Responsive to communication(s) filed on   |   |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2a)□  |   | action is non-final.  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 3)□   | _   |   |  |  |  |  |  |
| Dispositi                                     | on of Claims  |   |  |  |  |  |  |
| 5)<br>6)<br>7)                                | Claim(s) 1-41 is/are pending in the application.  4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdraw Claim(s) is/are allowed.  Claim(s) is/are rejected.  Claim(s) is/are objected to.  Claim(s) 1-41 are subject to restriction and/or e  |   |  |  |  |  |  |
| Applicati                                     | on Papers   |   |  |  |  |  |  |
|   | The specification is objected to by the Examiner  |   |  |  |  |  |  |
| 10)🖂  | The drawing(s) filed on <u>19 February 2002</u> is/are  |   |  |  |  |  |  |
|   | Applicant may not request that any objection to the d   |   |  |  |  |  |  |
| 11)   | Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction.  The oath or declaration is objected to by the Example 1.  |   | * *  |  |  |  |  |
| Priority u                                    | nder 35 U.S.C. § 119  |   |  |  |  |  |  |
| a)[   | Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign    All b) Some * c) None of:  1. Certified copies of the priority documents  2. Certified copies of the priority documents  3. Copies of the certified copies of the priori application from the International Bureau ee the attached detailed Office action for a list of  | have been received. have been received in Application ty documents have been received (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).   | on No<br>d in this National Stage  |  |  |  |  |
| Attachment                                    | • •   |   |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1) Notice                                     | e of References Cited (PTO-892)<br>e of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)  | 4) Interview Summary (I   |  |  |  |  |  |
| 3) 🔀 Inform                                   | e of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) nation Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) No(s)/Mail Date  | Paper No(s)/Mail Dat 5) Notice of Informal Pa 6) Other:   | e<br>tent Application (PTO-152)  |  |  |  |  |

Application/Control Number: 10/076,499

Art Unit: 1761

#### **DETAILED ACTION**

#### Election/Restrictions

Applicant's election with traverse of Group I, claims 1-3, 7-14 in Paper filed 8/17/2004 is acknowledged. The traversal is on the ground(s) that 1) the search for one group would necessarily include a search for the other groups, 2) compact prosecution would be promoted if the claims were all searched together and 3) multiple patent applications for the same invention does not promote public interest. This is not found persuasive because a protein is not an oil and a fertilizer is not a food product. They are classified separately and require separate searches. The traversal is not persuasive of error; it is based on applicant's opinions.

The requirement is still deemed proper and is therefore made FINAL.

### Specification

The disclosure is objected to because of the following informalities: Page 1, line 5 of the specification should be corrected as to the correct status of the parent case, 09/566728, "which is now abandoned".

Appropriate correction is required.

### Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Application/Control Number: 10/076,499

Art Unit: 1761

1. Claim 3 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

The preamble states "protein concentrates" lacks antecedent basis.

## Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

- (b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.
- 2. Claim 1 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by EP 1074605.

The patent abstract teaches all the steps claimed in claim 1 for rapeseed.

## Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

- (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.
- 3. Claims 1-3, 7-14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over EP 1074605 or Sakai et al. (US Patents 4946598 and 6517885) in

Application/Control Number: 10/076,499

Art Unit: 1761

view of EP 0925723, Kozlowska et al. (US Patent 4148789) and Bedford (US Patent 2851357).

EP '605 is as discussed above. Sakai et al. ('598) teach heating the mustard seed (col. 1, lines 55+), cracking and compressing to obtain the oil and simultaneously, it would have been obvious that protein meals are obtained. Although the patent does not teach de-hulling the '885 patent to the same inventor and to the same inventive concept teaches dehulling before de-oiling by pressing. It would have been obvious to incorporate such a step in the '598 patent. None of the above patents teaches adding animal offal, does not teach cooking the mixture, or solvent extraction (claim 7), or an antioxidant.

EP '723 teaches a protein-containing feedstuff, wherein the material that contains the vegetable protein is subjected to heat-treatment. The vegetable protein material is also subjected to dehulling (see page 4). At claim 30, the addition of an antioxidant is disclosed. Claim 31 teaches a mixture of vegetable lipids as well as "other animal products". Page 6 teaches cooking the protein and separating the solids from the liquids with a centrifuge/press. The protein is dried to a moisture content of 12% or less, preferably 5-10% (see lines 1-15). '789 teaches extraction of oil from rape seeds. Note in col. 1, the patentees teach at lines 60-65, solvent extraction. Also see col. 2, line 19.

Cols. 3 and 4 in the Bedford patent teaches in Examples 5-8, the addition of soybean to fish offals and cooking the mixture, and separating the stickwater and oil. Note the ratios of soybean oil to fish.

Thus it appears that each and every limitation was known in prior art for its intended use, and it would have been obvious to incorporate such steps for their benefits, into the inventions shown by the primary references '605, '598 and '885' all patents being drawn to the same feedstuff.

#### Conclusion

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to C. SAYALA whose telephone number is 571-272-1405.

The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

C. SAÝALA

Primary Examiner

Group 1700.